

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Science Subcommittee (SSc)

**04 January 2005 Meeting, 9:00 – 12:00 PM
USFWS Osuna Office Conference Room, Albuquerque, NM**

Agenda for 04 January 2005:

- Review and approval of notes from the previous SSc meeting
- PAP Update
- Process
- Action Items
- Next Meeting's Agenda

Review and Approval of Notes from the Previous SSc Meeting

- Draft notes from the previous SSc meeting were reviewed, minor edits were highlighted for incorporating into a revision, and the updated notes approved for distribution.

Project Advisory Panel (PAP) Update

- PAP report now expected by mid-January.
- Hours will be added for PAP in anticipation of them reviewing proposals for the SSc; this would also keep them informed on proposals submitted to the Program.
- Some SSc expressed concerns regarding the PAP review of Program proposals; a major one is that there are no flycatcher specialists on the PAP.
- Additional PAP members could be added to address flycatcher issues.

Proposal Review Process

- Schedule for review process is being finalized by Pete and Kathy Dickinson.
- First meeting of Technical Proposal Evaluation Committees (TPECs) after proposal review will be the first week in February.
- All proposal reviewers will be incorporated into TPECs and all will need to sign Conflict of Interest (COI) forms.
- The COI form has not been finalized yet. When complete, the original signed form will be sent by the individual TPEC members to Carla at Reclamation in Salt Lake City.
- After being notified by Carla, proposals will be released electronically to individual TPEC members by Pete.
- In the technical review process, each member will fill out a proposal review form, but not the numeric rating score, just comments on strengths and weaknesses. Costs will be reviewed later during a separate process.
- The chair will then develop a single form review form, which will include the consensus numeric rating scores; the chairs will be responsible for forwarding the information to Pete, who will compile all information from the TPECs. Scoring will be kept uniform.
- Proposal review responses compiled by Pete will be shared with subcommittee members.
- For proposals that the SSc determine as needed additional peer review, Pete can be requested to ask the PAP to provide a peer review.
- Pete – to add PAP to review for proposals 07, and 41-44.
- Funding for FY 2005 proposals is very limited; it is anticipated that better FY 2005 proposals will be carried over for FY 2006 funding.
- Oral presentation group will be reviewed by PMSc after all contracts are received. Presenters will respond to questions. This process will be decided upon.

- A consensus was reached that we should let those who need to attend present information.
- Oral presentations are worth 30 points. It will be determined how the 30 points will be given.
- Champe asked for the total funding requested in the Science proposals. Pete has incomplete information and will provide an update when it is available.
- Should we give others that do not participate in the PAP meeting a place on the review teams? Participation in a PAP reviewing a proposal requires attendance at review meeting for the PAP.

Problems/Priorities: Program/MRG datasets

- A general discussion occurred on questions about how much of the data that has been collected on the RGSM in the MGR has not be compiled, analyzed, or made available to help focus additional research and funding priorities for the Program? Some members have the impression the Program keeps getting proposals to fund very similar studies over and over, with out the results becoming generally available.
- Shouldn't all data collected during Program funded field research projects be made generally available through the Program within a reasonable period (e.g., 6-9 months) following completion of the field efforts and final reporting deadlines? Should they be part of the final reporting requirements, as defined in the RFP? What about data for past projects funded or conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation, COE, FWS, ISC, etc.?
- Data from the past needs to be available so we can decide what we need to fund.
- The fate of Program data is one of the requirements on which the PAP is expected to provide recommendations.
- Pete is going to obtain the data. Fish length and egg capture data needs to be available to present in PAP.
- Reclamation – ask Hector about receiving full set of raw field data and collected under Program funding and also data collected outside of the Program funding.
- Not only data, but also major project reports need to have better general availability.
- After Pete reviews Program reports, he intends to place them on the Program's web page.
- Many publications completed for MRG have not been peer reviewed, they are only technical reports. There is a danger to the Program in implementing actions based on conclusions from such efforts that lack independent, professional peer review, and that are of unsubstantiated scientific validity.
- Maybe the PAP can review some reports.
- Need to pursue a MRG data compilation effort; Nic and Mike will develop list of data that need to be compiled
- Pete can get a request to have compiled data that will be assessed by one of the Program subcontractors.
- How much assessment is needed?
- In the future, the RFPs for focused research projects should include requirements for hypotheses testing, peer review, and publications.

Action Items

- Pete will provide an update when available on the total funding requested in the Science proposals.
- Nic - provide a list of studies and data types that should be included in the Program library and databases.
- Nic – find out AGO representation for review of proposals.
- Cristina – ask Alex to see if he wants to participate in specific TPECs.
- Cristina - add April Sanders to SSc distribution list.

Proposed Agenda for 18 January 2005 SSc Meeting, 9:00 AM, FWS on Osuna in Albuquerque:

- Review and approval of notes from the previous SSc meetings
- Brief updates:
 - PMSc, InSC, and/or EC
 - The Long-Term Plan
 - PAP
 - Perennial pools workgroup
- FY 2005 Program proposal review process
- Problems/Priorities (if time is available):
 - Data and reports from previous MRG studies
 - Perennial Pools discussion
- Proposed agenda for next meeting

**Science Subcommittee
04 January 2005 Meeting Attendees**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | PHONE NUMBER | EMAIL ADDRESS |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sterling Grogan, co-chair | MRGCD | 247-0235 | grogan@mrgcd.com |
| Nic Medley | NMAGO (NMISC) | 827-5811 | nmedley@ose.state.nm.us |
| Charles Fischer | USBR | 462-3656 | cfischer@uc.usbr.gov |
| John Sorrell | Pueblo of Isleta | 869-9623 | POI36002@IsletaPueblo.com |
| Cody B. Walker | Pueblo of Isleta | 869-9633 | POI36004@IsletaPueblo.com |
| Champe Green | USACE | 342-3357 | champe.b.green@usace.army.mil |
| Chris Altenbach | City of ABQ | 848-7128 | caltenbach@cabq.gov |
| Pete David | MRG ESA CP Program Manager | 761-4743 | peter_david@fws.gov |
| Cristina Radu | TtEMI | 881-3188 | cristina.radu@ttemi.com |